R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 016 748 UD 005 387

AN ADDENDUM TO INTEGRATION--A PLAN FOR BERKELEY. A REPORT TO BERKELEY BOARD OF EDUCATION.

BY- SULLIVAN, NEIL V.
BERKELEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, CALIF.

PUB DATE 2 JAN 68

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$2.12 51P.

DESCRIPTORS- *SCHOOL INTEGRATION, *BUS TRANSPORTATION, *EDUCATIONAL FINANCE, *INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS, *SCHOOL ZONING, INTEGRATION PLANS, ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, PROGRAM PROPOSALS, READING PROGRAMS, SPECIAL EDUCATION, HETEROGENEOUS GROUPING, ORIENTATION, TAX SUPPORT, BUDGETING, LEARNING LABORATORIES, SPECIAL SERVICES, INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION, BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

THE BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA, PLAN FOR DESEGREGATING THE CITY'S ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IS REVIEWED IN THIS REPORT. THE PLAN DEALS WITH SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION, INSTRUCTIONAL NEEDS AND CHANGE, TRANSPORTATION, AND FINANCING REQUIREMENTS. IT IS SUGGESTED THAT THE CITY HAVE FOUR EXPANDED ATTENDANCE ZONES, EACH CONTAINING ONE SCHOOL WITH GRADES ONE THROUGH SIX AND FROM TWO TO FOUR SCHOOLS WITH KINDERGARTEN THROUGH THIRD GRADE. THE PROPOSED INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM WOULD INCLUDE A DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAM FOR READING, INSERVICE TRAINING OF TEACHERS, TEACHING SPECIALISTS, HETEROGENEOUS GROUPING, SPECIAL HELP FOR UNDERACHIEVING, HANDICAPPED, AND HIGH POTENTIAL STUDENTS, LEARNING LABORATORIES, AND HELP CENTERS STAFFED BY TEACHERS, PSYCHOLOGISTS, AND GUIDANCE PERSONNEL. THERE WOULD BE CONTINUAL DIAGNOSIS AND EVALUATION OF THE PUPILS AND TEACHERS WOULD MAINTAIN HIGH EXPECTATIONS OF THEIR PUPILS' PERFORMANCE. THE SCHOOLS' STARTING TIMES WOULD BE STAGGERED TO MINIMIZE THE TOTAL NUMBER OF NEEDED BUSES. AN ORIENTATION PROGRAM PREPARING STUDENTS FOR THE BUSING WOULD BE CONDUCTED. THE PROGRAM WOULD BE FINANCED THROUGH A TAX ELECTION WHICH WOULD TAKE PLACE BEFORE JULY 1969. PERTINENT QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ABOUT THE PLAN ARE PRESENTED IN AN APPENDIX. (LB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

05387

ED016748

AN ADDENDUM

to

I N T E G R A T I O N :

A P L A N F O R B E R K E L E Y

January 2, 1968

A REPORT OF

Neil V. Sullivan, Ed. D.
Superintendent of Schools

to the

BERKELEY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Arnold L. Grossberg, President
Mrs. Carol R. Sibley, Vice President
David E. Nelson
Dr. Samuel A. Schaaf
Rev. W. Hazaiah Williams

UD005 387

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I	INTRODUCTION
II	REFINEMENTS OF ORGANIZATIONAL PLAN
III	INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM
IV	TRANSPORTATION
V	FINANCE
VI	APPENDIX

INTRODUCTION

One of the major goals of the Berkeley Unified School District in developing a plan for integration, was to promote continual involvement of the staff and community. After the Summer Staff Task Groups submitted their proposals for desegregation, various opportunities were provided staff and community to discuss, analyze and offer suggestions and amendments to all proposals. The Lay Citizens Advisory Council, a committee of seven community representatives, reviewed the Summer Staff Task Groups' recommendations and presented its reaction to the administration. The entire school staff, both elementary and secondary, was brought together in small groups for the purpose of exchanging reactions to the proposals and offering recommendations. These recommendations were then compiled onto response forms and made available to the Superintendent's Staff Advisory Council on Integration.

This group of 30 educators consisting of the Superintendent's Administrative Council, the Summer Staff Task Groups for both logistics and instruction, representatives of both teacher organizations as well as principals and special departments, came together on September 25 to review the Summer Staff Task Groups' recommendations as well as all responses and suggestions from school staff and community. The Council worked

together with the Superintendent for a period of five days, during which time the document Integration: A Plan for Berkeley was developed. The document was produced by the 30 members of the Council after a series of both small-group and assembly workshops in which all aspects of the plan were researched and developed. The process of developing the proposal began with a review by the full Council of a summary prepared by the District's research department containing all reactions, both community and school staff, to the five prototypes recommended by the Summer Staff Task Groups.

The Council then set about to determine which of the logistical plans seemed most feasible in the light of all of the information available to them. After four days of consideration the entire Council agreed that the K-3, 4-6 plan, as an organizational arrangement, was the most workable. On the fifth day, all of the Council proposals related to the various aspects of the plan were edited and compiled into a single unit, which became the document presented to the Board.

The document was made available for distribution at the October 3 Board meeting at which the integration plan was reported to the Board and the community. Distribution of the report began at that meeting. Subsequently, copies of the document were made available at all of the community meetings conducted on the subject of integration. Copies were also mailed to public libraries, PTAs, community service organizations,

churches, governmental agencies and interested communities throughout the country. Copies of the document, along with summaries of the main features of the plan, were issued to the news media. Special television and radio programs on the subject were conducted.

To insure the widest possible dissemination of information, a Speakers Bureau which had been developed early in September was used to provide community groups with resource persons to explain the plan, and the background of events leading up to it. The Bureau consisted of the 30 members of the District staff.

During the period from early September to mid-December, approximately 40 meetings were held by various community groups in which Speaker Bureau members participated. The groups conducting the meetings included PTAs, churches, and such political, civic and service organizations as the West Berkeley Neighborhood Council, NAACP, Community for New Politics, the YMCA, the West Berkeley Neighborhood Association, the Berkeley Realty Board and the Kiwanis Club. All but two of the PTA units in the city representing the 14 elementary schools conducted public meetings on the integration proposal. The Speakers Bureau provided both panel and individual speakers for these occasions. Additional meetings were conducted by council-wide PTAs representing all of the schools. House meetings throughout the community were conducted by the various PTA units. An Integration Committee was established by the Berkeley-Albany PTA Council

through which information on the integration proposal and the various developments relating to the whole subject of the forthcoming integration could be transmitted to the various parent bodies throughout the community. The Intergroup Education Project and the Friends of Intergroup are co-sponsoring community inservice sessions designed to stimulate further dialogue throughout the community. Invitations have been issued to civic organizations advising them of the availability of speakers and referring them to the Bureau for assistance in arrangements.

Since October 3, when the proposal was presented to the community, six Board meetings and three workshops have been held. Community reaction to the integration plan has occurred at each of the Board meetings. The workshops, conducted as public open forums, have dealt exclusively with the issue of integration and have been for the purpose of public interchange.

Through this period of study and community dialogue several problems have become apparent and have been dealt with. Some have been resolved. Others are still being worked on. The solutions to some will of necessity require extensive efforts over a long-range period. Problems -- some real, some feared -- which have become relevant to the discussion of elementary integration include the following:

1. <u>Pupil Transportation</u> - This subject is discussed elsewhere, both in the October 3 report and in other parts of this

addendum. The concern of people over "busing" per se, has diminished substantially as the excellent safety record of busing in other communities has been brought to light. Furthermore, the realization that massive numbers of youngsters of all age levels in many places across the nation are being bused to school helps to put this issue into proper perspective. As the community discussion has proceeded, the focus has been less on busing itself and more on what takes place at the end of the bus ride.

There has been some discussion of the fairness of busing, since K-3 youngsters will be going in one direction while grades 4-6 will be going in the other. This also was recognized and discussed in the October 3 report. While it is true that certain sections of the city will be having their youngsters transported at an earlier age than will other sections, the busing load more nearly evens out when we consider the elementary years as a whole. Under the plan we have recommended, virtually every elementary student in the city will share in the busing experience for approximately half of his elementary years. This is a much more equitable arrangement than that employed by any major city in the nation. This issue, too, is being seen more and more in perspective, but it is an issue that had to be faced frankly.

2. Quality of Education - Concern over the quality of education offered our young people is, and should be, a continuing problem whether we are integrating our schools or not. However, the instance of a major change in organization focuses a spotlight on this important aspect of our school life. We have a school program that compares very favorably with those offered in other districts. Our favorable pupil-teacher ratio, our award winning elementary library program, our extensive use of teacher aides and volunteer lay assistants are important aspects of our program.

We have what is basically a unified curriculum across the district but one which encourages creative staff variations designed to meet student needs as perceived by each local school faculty. Our central administration has to walk a fine line, providing the necessary leadership for the instructional program while at the same time encouraging initiative by local school faculties and individual teachers in developing creative innovations. As will be explained in another section of this document, much work has already been done in the task of developing instructional program to go with integration next year. However, this is more of a long-range process than is the development of logistical plans. In fact, much of the important curriculum development can best be completed after decisions are made concerning the basic structure framework (i.e., the

logistical Plan) within which it will operate.

3. The Question of Student Safety and Decorum - This is a subject which constantly concerns school people, whether facing integration or not. We will continue to provide as much adult supervision as possible. We further feel that the Help Centers envisioned for the 4-6 schools will help to maintain the kind of decorum we seek. This is a subject to which we shall continue to address ourselves as we develop the program to be offered in each school.

4. Finance - This problem has been and continues to be given serious consideration in our business office. It is discussed elsewhere in this report and was the subject of an extensive document presented to the Board on November 6.

In working on these problems with the staff and the community we have faced the challenge of providing needed leadership while avoiding authoritarianism. This fine balance has not always been easy to achieve. However, we firmly believe our enlightened staff and community are capable of coming up with imaginative and effective solutions to problems when given the opportunity. This faith has been vindicated. The response from the staff and community -- and the contributions received -- have been instrumental in developing the plans presented to the Board to date.

With the help received from a wide range of members of the staff and community people, we have made excellent progress in

attacking the problems related to integration. From a logistical standpoint we feel that we have developed a plan that is practical and effective. However, much of the work in developing the details of an instructional program will be vitally affected by the type of logistical plan which is adopted by the Board. For this reason, as early a decision as possible is needed. Therefore, we welcome the Board's decision, made at its December meeting, to take action on a logistical plan at the January 16 meeting.

REFINEMENTS OF ORGANIZATIONAL PLAN

In the weeks which have followed the October 3 recommendations for elementary school integration in the Berkeley District by the Superintendent to the Board of Education, alternate plans and modifications have been received, reviewed, and discussed. In evaluating these proposed modifications, racial and socio-economic balance among the attendance zones have been given top priority. The school housing needs and transportation requirements of the plan also received major consideration.

Rather detailed suggested alternative plans were received from Mr. D. C. Ipsen, The Whittier P.T.A. Integration Group, and the Community for New Politics Integration Committee. These proposals were reviewed with the submitting groups and subjected to detailed analysis thereafter. As a consequence, it has been possible to adopt portions of some of these proposals and incorporate them as refinements to the October Report. When compared with the October K-3, 4-6 Plan, fewer boundary changes were necessary, and better socio-economic balance and reduced transportation needs were obtained through these suggestions.

Under this plan the city would be divided into four expanded attendance zones; each zone containing one 4-6 school, and two, three, or four separate kindergarten-3 schools.

Thus, schools would be assigned to the following attendance zones:

Zone A: Cragmont Primary (K-3)
Thousand Oaks (K-3)
Jefferson (K-3)
Franklin (4-6)

Zone B: Oxford (K-3)
Cragmont (K-3)
Columbus (4-6)

Zone C: Hillside and Hillside K-P (K-3)
Washington (K-3)
Whittier (K-3)
Longfellow (4-6)

Zone D: John Muir (K-3)
Emerson (K-3)
Le Conte (K-3)
Lincoln (4-6)

Franklin Primary would not be used as a school site.

The October Report promised that, when available, up-to-date racial census data for the current school year would be used to determine distribution of elementary school students throughout the community. Under review by the Board of Education are specific zone, school, and attendance boundary lines for that purpose.

Each zone has only one 4-6 school; therefore, all the fourth, fifth, and sixth graders in the zone will attend this school. The 4-6 school in Zone A is Franklin, in Zone B is Columbus, in Zone C is Longfellow, and in Zone D is Lincoln. Insofar as possible zone, school, and attendance boundary lines were drawn to coincide with city streets.

The secondary school attendance boundaries have in no way been altered from the current boundaries. That is, all students who live within the Garfield Attendance area will continue to attend Garfield School, and those students who reside in the Willard Attendance area will continue to attend Willard School.

The Berkeley District's Student Transfer Policy will continue in force next year. Within District policy, exceptions to attendance regulations may be possible through special permits. The new program requires many changes in attendance procedures, however, so that all requests for permits will have to be carefully evaluated. All permits are issued for one year only, and thus those currently in force will be automatically cancelled at the end of the school year, June 1968. Persons wishing to request new permits will have to do so by contacting the District Attendance Office.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND RACIAL DISTRIBUTION BY SCHOOLS WITHIN ZONES

ZONE	SCHOOLS	GRADES	ENROLLMENT	NEGRO PERCENTAGE
A		K-6	2379	39
	Cragmont Primary	K-3	127	37
	Thousand Oaks	K-3	552	37
	Jefferson	K-3	734	38
	Franklin	4-6	966	40
B		K-6	1736	39
	Cragmont	K-3	677	41
	Oxford	K-3	304	39
	Columbus	4-6	755	39
C		K-6	2753	42
	Hillside &		H. 397	41
	Hillside Primary	K-3	H.P. 215	40
	Washington	K-3	567	43
	Whittier	K-3	545	41
	Longfellow	4-6	1029	44
D		K-6	1942	42
	John Muir	K-3	410	42
	Emerson	K-3	288	43
	LeConte	K-3	458	44
	Lincoln	4-6	786	40
District Total Enrollment			8810	
District Negro Percentage				41

From the above table it can be determined that all four zones, and all sixteen schools within the zones are within the racial percentage tolerances of 35-45 percent.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

In presenting a plan for integration of the elementary schools to the Board of Education, certain recommendations were made relative to the instructional program. These were outlined on pages 17 through 24 in Integration: A Plan for Berkeley.

When the integration proposals were presented, it was stated that consideration would be given to the instructional program as it relates to integration and that these considerations would be given over a period of time.

Since that time, much discussion and planning have taken place and, as intended, much more discussion and planning will continue in defining the processes to be followed and in the implementation of the instructional program. A review of some specific attention given to this program since the report and some suggestions for its development follow:

1. Development of Scope and Sequence

   A study group of Berkeley staff under the direction of University of California Extension Division has been formed to define the scope and sequence of reading and communication skills. This will aid in the implementation of a developmental program for reading. It will note the prime skills that should be taught in

reading and language arts and outline an order of the progression of instruction. We believe this can be done and still provide maximum flexibility for individual schools and individual teachers within the schools. For example, we have no plans at this time to propose that the Berkeley schools go to a single basal series or to say that a teacher or a particular school must stop using the materials or program that they were using if these are effective.

2. Inservice Training of Staff

a. A representative group of teachers from all elementary schools is continuing to meet to determine the greatest inservice needs of the staff. They have given, as their first priority, a study of our current program of reading. Meetings are being scheduled in which such programs as the Columbus Reading Program, the Whittier Multi-Age Grouping for Reading, I.T.A., Open Court, Lippincott, and others, will be presented to the total elementary staff and discussed in small group sessions. The familiarity with these programs will aid in evaluation of materials and in the transition of pupils in these various programs.

Another priority determined by these teacher representatives is entitled, "The Teacher and the Learner." It is anticipated that consultants will be brought to the District to speak to the teachers and review the

nature of learning. Teachers will meet in small groups to react to the presentations and to discuss their experiences in this area. The Intergroup Office will provide materials for these meetings relative to the preparation of children for integration.

The third phase of this inservice training program will relate to grouping for effective instruction. Most of these meetings will be carried on at the zone or local school level after the staff members have received their assignments for next year and when class compositions will be determined.

In the establishment of a program in the newly organized schools at both the primary and intermediate levels, basic guidelines will be established to give continuity in program and to enhance articulation between schools within a zone. A basic theme must be established for the schools; yet the individual schools must be allowed freedom for flexibility and experimentation. In other words, "variations to the theme" will be operable.

b. The Teacher Exchange Program is underway and 235 teachers have already had the opportunity to observe and teach in schools other than their own and in another section of the City. Seventeen small group seminars of teachers have been held so that teachers could discuss their

experiences and they are submitting suggestions as a result of these experiences and meetings. We have found this approach of teacher observation and participation to be very meaningful in the preparation for the integration of our schools.

3. Teaching Specialists

   a. The possibility of initiating the SCIS (Science Curriculum Improvement Study of the National Science Foundation) program in the intermediate schools is still being pursued and outside funding is being sought by the District and the University of California for the training of teachers and for materials for this program. If this can be achieved, science will be taught by specialists who would then also serve as the teachers of health and family living.

   b. The feasibility of offering French in 1968-69, in addition to Spanish, at grade 6 is still being explored.

   c. Specialists would, of course, teach French if it is offered. Specialists may be used in other areas, such as math and physical education. The extent of specialization will be determined when the principals have been assigned and have had an opportunity to become involved in this aspect of the study. Limits

of specialization will be established so that children will not be expected to relate to a large number of teachers during the course of a day. It is anticipated that a child in the intermediate school may relate to approximately four different teachers. There will be less specialization at the primary level than at the intermediate level and the program offered in the primary grades especially will continue to emphasize learning in reading and the other communication skills. When children fall behind in this area, additional time and emphasis will be given to their needs.

4. Grouping

The integration proposal notes that children will be grouped heterogeneously by "race, sex, academic performance and, if possible, by socio-economic level." It further notes that groups "will be formed and re-formed during the day, week or school year to teach particular skills in cluster groups within the classroom structure or between individual classrooms. Maximum effort will be made to avoid racially segregated groups within the classrooms and in school activities." This continues to be the plan for grouping.

Questions are raised relative to the effective teaching of students with a range of achievement levels. The range of achievement in classrooms currently is extensive. It is

not uncommon now in Berkeley and in public education generally, for example, to have in the same 6th grade classroom students with a reading achievement range from 3rd grade level to a 10th or 11th grade level (based on test results). As teaching improves and learning takes place, in any situation, the span of achievement should increase.

In the grouping of children, however, it does not mean that one teacher will have children at each grade level of the nine levels from 3rd through 11th grade achievement in a particular class. For example, three hypothetical 6th grade classes may consist of clusters of children working at the following reading grade levels:

Class I	Group A	11th grade level
	Group B	8th grade level
	Group C	3rd grade level
Class II	Group A	10th grade level
	Group B	5th grade level
	Group C	3rd grade level
Class III	Group A	11th grade level
	Group B	7th grade level
	Group C	4th grade level

The bulk of the children are in the less extreme ranges than indicated above and in the lower grades there is less of a range.

The Berkeley schools currently practice content acceleration in such areas as reading and math. A child in the 3rd grade, for example, who is achieving at the 4th grade level in reading will be using reading materials at that

higher level. This 3rd grader may be at the 4th grade level in reading and continue to work at the 3rd grade level in math. However, if a 3rd grade child is achieving at the 4th grade level in math, he will be working in materials at that level. The Science Research Associates program in math, adopted recently in Berkeley, lends itself readily to such content acceleration. This 3rd grade example, of course, also applies to children at other grade levels. This approach is a form of an ungraded program. In addition to the content acceleration, the program is also expanded for the high achievers and they work on supplemental material which goes into greater depth on a particular topic or project.

This means that the needs of the 3rd grader who is achieving at 5th or 6th grade level in reading or in math can be met in the primary school. Conversely, there would be appropriate instructional groups at the intermediate school for the 5th or 6th grader who is working below grade level. If, however, a student were doing most of his basic work below or greatly above grade level an evaluation would be made of his total educational, physical, and social needs; and where it seemed appropriate, he would be retained or advanced in grade placement.

As we move toward new methods of teaching team approaches and flexible scheduling, we will be moving toward

the greater individualization of instruction which is the essence of maximal learning.

5. Special Help for Pupils

This special help will be provided in a variety of ways.

a. The children who are under-achievers will be given supportive help. This will be accomplished in several ways. Integration: A Plan for Berkeley outlines the variety of approaches to give this support. The ESEA program has since been revised to concentrate on the specific children with the greatest need. These services, now provided in the target schools, will follow the pupils in the various schools next year in such forms as teachers, teacher-aides, psychologists, guidance teachers, and special materials.

b. A program of remedial reading currently exists in the District and it consists of ten teachers in that program. These teachers provide a resource service to classroom teachers and do extensive teaching in small groups and individually for children needing this service. The emphasis is placed on children in the early grades. This program will be continued and additional State support is being sought.

c. Classes for the physically handicapped, mentally retarded, and emotionally handicapped will continue at the present level and expand as more children are

qualified for participation through screening process in effect and as increased State support makes this possible. Additional State support will permit the expansion of the speech therapy program.

d. The program for the high potential student will continue at its present level and will expand as increased State support is provided. Pupils are continuing to be identified for this program and support is being given to the teachers in program planning and in the provision of materials. The learning laboratory to be established at the intermediate schools will provide a supplemental service to the high potential student. District personnel are currently working with members of the Berkeley Association for the Gifted and with a State Department representative to evaluate the current program and make recommendations for its improvement. It is already apparent that one of the first recommendations to the Board of Education will be the establishment of a full-time coordinator of the high potential program, K-12. This position will be supported by additional State funding.

e. Concerted effort is being made to increase the number of volunteers who give support to the program. The School Resource Volunteers are making a drive to recruit more volunteers as tutors. These volunteers

are being recruited from the total community and a special emphasis will be given to recruiting in West Berkeley. Agencies of the University are also being contacted for volunteers from the University student body.

6. Learning Laboratories

Page 22 of Integration: A Plan for Berkeley gives an overview of long term and immediate goals of the Learning Laboratory. Planning for this facility continues from the standpoint of function, staffing, and facility development. Current plans are to have a teacher and an aide in the center in each of the intermediate schools to provide the program outlined. The EPOCH (Educational Programming of Cultural Heritage) has designed several possible plans for such a facility. These will now be priced out and the most feasible plan will be selected after further study by the teachers and other members of the staff.

7. Help Centers

The concept of the Help Centers as outlined on page 24 of the integration report is to be further refined by classroom teachers, psychologists, and guidance teachers. The staff of the Sausalito schools has made time available to Berkeley for a workshop to study the center concept developed in their district. According to present plans,

the Help Centers would be staffed by a team consisting of a teacher, a psychologist, a guidance teacher and an aide.

8. Evaluation

The need for an effective means of evaluation continues to receive attention. Since the integration report of October 3, the Board of Education has created the position of Coordinator of Evaluation for the District and this position will supplement the comprehensive evaluation which is necessary. The University of California is continuing to give consideration to support of such an evaluation and several meetings have been held in this regard. Six members of the Berkeley administrative staff have recently attended a conference on the evaluation of integration in Riverside, California, which evaluation was done jointly by the Riverside School department and the University of California at Riverside. The conference, which included personnel from Sacramento and Stockton, was arranged by the State Department of Compensatory Education. At the conference, a follow-up meeting was planned with members of the State Department to utilize their knowledge in planning the Berkeley evaluation and to enlist their support in the pursuit of funds and research personnel.

9. Expectations

A section in the integration proposal emphasizes the

expectations that will be made of children. It is re-emphasized here that children can and will learn. An attitude of high expectations must prevail in the schools. A pupil's progress must be continually evaluated. His learning and behavior problems must be diagnosed and prescribed teaching must take place. This will be achieved through greater attention to this concern in inservice training of staff and through the development of more specific pupil achievement profile records.

It has frequently been stated during the past months that there are two areas of concern about the behavior of children. It is stated that the children of West Berkeley are generally more aggressive physically and the parents of East Berkeley are concerned that their children may be hurt by this behavior. It is also stated that the children of East Berkeley are generally more aggressive verbally, sometimes subtly, and that the parents of West Berkeley fear that their children may be hurt by this. The recognition of these concerns is being given consideration in program planning and in the establishment of guidelines for decorum in the schools.

An observation made by teachers in the exchange visitations is that children in various parts of the City have different rules for their playground games. It is planned that uniform rules for games be established and that a

plan for organized games at noon-time be put into effect.

While some may consider these to be relatively insignificant matters, it is given as an illustration of the concerns that are being expressed and the detailed planning that must be done. Such details can be most significant in the area of decorum and expectations as will be the planning for yard and hallway supervision generally.

In the section on expectations, it seems pertinent to mention the matter of confidence. Some anxieties are being felt and some concerns are being expressed about the quality of education as it relates to integration. These are legitimate feelings and expressions on the part of all segments in the Berkeley community. These are apparent because all of us want the best for our children and this is as it should be. We are concerned because there is also a natural reaction to change and to the unknown generally.

We will integrate the schools because it is morally right to do so and we will integrate because we believe it can improve the quality of education socially and academically for children. The limited evidence available bears out the fact that achievement in integrated schools generally improves and because such is the case generally, it can certainly be true for Berkeley specifically. Not all the answers to the instructional program can be given at this time. All the answers will never be given but more

and more of them will evolve in the months ahead as the staff and the community continue to plan together in confidence.

TRANSPORTATION

School starting and closing hours will be a major factor affecting the costs of the transportation in 1968. The hours will also have an important effect in determining who will be able to effectively operate the buses.

A one-half hour differential in the starting time of the K-3 and the 4-6 schools would make two-way busing possible, thereby reducing the total number of buses needed. The following schedule of proposed starting times, as compared to the existing school hours, is recommended.

	Present	Proposed Under K-3 4-6 Integration Plan
A.M. Kindergarten	8:50 - 11:25*	9:00 - 12:00
P.M. Kindergarten	12:35* - 3:10	12:20 - 3:20
Grades 1 - 3	8:50 - 2:00	9:00 - 2:10
Grades 1 - 3	10:00 - 3:10	10:10 - 3:20
Grades 4 - 6	8:50 - 3:10	8:30 - 2:50
Garfield and Willard	8:30 - 3:15	no change
East Campus B.H.S.	8:30 - 3:00	no change
West Campus B.H.S.	8:20 - 3:00	no change
Berkeley High School	8:00 - 3:00	no change

*Some Kindergartens have already changed to 180 minute schedule:

8:50 - 11:50
12:10 - 3:10

*Follow-Through Kindergartens are 8:50 - 2:00

This schedule would start the 4-6 schools twenty minutes earlier than they now start, making their starting times the same as that of the Junior High Schools. The K-3 schools would

start ten minutes later than the present 8:50 a.m. starting time. The K-3 children being bused would leave home about the same time they do now walking to school.

Preparing Students for Transportation

After final routes and time schedules are determined in the spring, we will conduct an orientation program for all children to receive transportation, and in addition to classroom instructions in safety in school buses, actually have each child picked up at his assigned stop and taken to his new school. This would be repeated in early June so that every child will have a map and time schedule and know his or her assigned bus stop before school is out in June.

Each school will have route maps and time schedules to give to pupils who are new to Berkeley, when they come in to register. We would also ask the newspapers to publish the time schedules the week before school opens.

Junior Traffic Police will continue to serve at the grades 4-6 schools. Since these will be large schools, only 6th graders will probably be used in the program. There will be no 10 o'clockers, so the number of duties will be reduced. This could mean that officers would only have to serve just one period each day. This would reduce classroom disruption and the amount of time each boy would lose from his class time.

The School District and the City officials will study crossing needs at the K-3 schools when the final integration plan is adopted to determine what protection will be needed by the children walking to and from each school.

Recommendations will be made for protection and how it can be financed. Additional crossing guards, signal lights or other alternatives will be considered.

FINANCE

A supplementary financial report to Integration: A Plan for Berkeley, prepared by the Director of Business Services on November 6, presented cost projections of both the K-6 and the K-3, 4-6 plans. The projections contained in that report are still appropriate to either plan.

Subsequent to that report, however, other specific questions relating to the financing of integration have been asked by several people in the community. The following are typical examples and our responses to their questions.

Question 1: How do we pay the differential of cost of integration in FY 1970 and FY 1971?

Answer 1: Important as this question is, the more significant question is -- "How do we pay the cost of the continuing program in FY 1970 and FY 1971?" If expenditures are realized as projected, the only recourse is to a tax election prior to July 1, 1969. Failure to pass a tax election at that time would mean that the level of quality of education will be lowered. Integration, per se, does not create this financial problem although it does increase the dollars needed.

Question 2: How do the six Franklin K-P classrooms get relocated within the District?

Answer 2: The classrooms at Franklin K-P are relocatable buildings which originally came from Codornices Village. These units are some of the better bungalows in the District.

Question 3: How do we finance salary schedule adjustments for counselors, department heads and other certificated positions?

Answer 3: FY 1969 had a 2% allocation for salary increases, FY 1970 had a 4½% allocation and FY 1971 had a 3½% allocation. The report included these allocations for the purpose of indicating to the Board what monies might be used to prevent erosion of the salary schedule. The Board retains the prerogative of making the final decision as to whether these monies will be used for salary schedule adjustments or for salary increases.

Question 4: Can you and will you assure the parents and taxpayers of Berkeley that they will not in the future be charged for the transportation of their children in addition to the extremely high school taxes now being paid?

Answer 4: The finance study of integration did not even consider collecting charges from parents of transported students. Integrated elementary schools are a task to be faced by the entire Berkeley community and the cost of transporting students should be borne by the total community, not just the parents of those students being transported.

Question 5: a. Will parents be required to bring their children to central stops?

b. Will any supervision be given at such stops if buses are delayed?

c. Has consideration been given to the fact that AC buses cannot undertake more than a 17% grade and will not go where it is necessary to back up to turn around?

d. Will feeder lines have to be established to allow the system to work?

Answer 5: There are many details regarding transportation that can only be resolved after the Board has made a decision on the plan of organization. However, the above questions were considered in working out a transportation procedure and can be tentatively answered pending more precise and detailed planning.

a. Parents presently are not required to bring children to schools of attendance and there is no reason to assume they would be required to bring children to central stops.

b. At present no supervision is provided by the District for students going to school and there is no reason to assume that supervision at bus stops would be required. The transportation procedure takes into consideration the possibility of bus breakdown and delay. For this reason, all transportation procedures developed to date

provide for stand-by vehicles to be utilized in event of emergency.

c. AC Transit District officials very carefully worked out tentative routes which took into consideration the limitations of their vehicles -- grade, turning, etc.

d. Assuming that a feeder line system incorporates a feature of transfer, then the response to this question is that no plan considered to date requires a feeder line organization. All routes would be from bus stop to school of attendance without transfer or utilization of feeder lines.

Question 6: a. Is it not true then that such aid (State Transportation Apportionment) would not be available to Berkeley until 1970?

b. Have you considered in your budget plans the fact that reimbursement under State transportation allowance is therefore uncertain?

Answer 6: a. At the time the finance report was written we did not have at our disposal the 1967 revisions to the Education Code and the finance report was based on the concept that Pupil Transportation Costs are to be placed on a current-year basis. However, even if cash receipts are not received in the year of expenditure, this is not a unique or disastrous situation. We budget income and expenditures in many cases where the cash is not actually received in the same year that the expense is incurred,

but proper accounting procedures call for the matching of income with related expense and expense with related income. Monies which are receivable at year-end are offset by accounts which are payable at year-end.

b. All State reimbursement monies are subject to reduction on a pro rata basis when State funds are insufficient. However, the experience of reductions in State reimbusements to the District in prior years has been very minor and has not been a consistent occurrence each year. In order to allow for such deficiencies in the operating budget the District allocates an annual amount in its Reserve to cover deficiencies in income.

Question 7: a. Have you more accurate figures concerning the cost of traffic guards?

b. Is the School Board working this out with the City?

Answer 7: a. Our estimate of traffic guard costs was between $90,000 and $95,000. The lower limit of the estimate in the article ($95,000 - $105,000) is the same as the upper limit and we can, therefore, assume that the two estimates are relatively close.

b. The School Board is not ignoring safety nor is it trying to absolve itself of responsibility for the safety of children in <u>any</u> respect. Mr. W. B. Rhodes has been in contact with representatives of the City and

additional contact in the future between City and District personnel is being planned.

The task of providing school crossing guards has been effective in cities such as Richmond, Fremont, South San Francisco, San Jose, Sacramento, Long Beach, Bakersfield, Vallejo and Fresno.

Question 8: a. What arrangements are being made to pay for the cost of service presently performed for school cafeterias by service girls?

b. Will you give an estimate of these costs?

Answer 8: a. Miss Arlene Kasa, Supervisor of Food Services, has been working on this situation with her cafeteria managers.

b. Approximately one hour per day of serving time would be required at each elementary school. One hour x 180 days x 10 schools x $2.00 per hour = $3,600. This would, in part, be reduced by meals presently received by service girls for the time they serve -- about $1,300. This net cost, $2,300 can be assumed by the Cafeteria Fund operations income if the Fund is not faced with additional personnel benefit increases.

Question 9: Will it be possible for students to participate in hot lunch programs at Cragmont K-P and Hillside K-P?

Answer 9: In view of the fact that Cragmont and Hillside Primaries do not presently have lunch service, facilities

required for a lunch program are not available at these sites. Therefore, it would be necessary to transport from one or more operating units (Oxford and/or Hillside), consequently placing greater loads on these units, transport vehicles, packaging materials, transport containers, refrigeration facilities at the Primaries for milk and an area in which to serve the lunches. As to whether the lunches should be the hot or cold type, Miss Kasa recommends a hot pre-packaged lunch program. This program offers a better variety of foods than a cold lunch, resulting in better participation. Other districts do utilize private vehicles for transportation. Both programs would require packaging materials and transport containers. The hot program would require transport containers which keep hot foods hot. Maintenance of proper temperatures in holding of prepared foods is a "must."

Question 10: a. Since it is indicated that the maximum amount available will be needed, and the provisions of Education Code 15517 allows a levy of $0.10 per $100 of assessed valuation, may we assume that such a tax will also be levied for at least one year?

b. Can you assure the Berkeley taxpayers that this will only be levied one year?

Answer 10: a. In order to raise the $198,000 needed for building renovation to meet State Fire Marshal requirements,

it will be necessary to levy the $0.10 override tax in FY 69.

b. The money raised in FY 69 plus the money presently in the State Fire Marshal Reserve should cover the costs of necessary building renovation. The tax, although not levied in FY 70, would be applied against the Unsecured Roll in FY 70 and would restore the approximately $20,000 to the State Fire Marshal Reserve. There is no reason to believe that the tax would be levied beyond FY 69. In fact, the statute allows the override only through FY 69.

Question 11: In view of the recent history of local property tax increases, can we not assume that the possibility of receiving money under the provisions of AB 272 is extremely remote?

Answer 11: No, we definitely cannot assume that receipt of additional money for tax reduction purposes is extremely remote. In fact, it will be extremely probable. The Property Tax Relief Fund, Section 152 of Chapter 963 of the Statutes of the 1967 Regular Session of the Legislature, provides for property tax reductions to be implemented in accord with regulations established by the 1968 Regular Session of the Legislature. If the Legislature acts in 1968, there will be tax reduction in FY 69 and there will be additional money from the State to compensate for this

tax reduction. The money has been appropriated by the Legislature for tax reduction and, therefore, the question is not one of whether or not tax reduction will become a fact, but, rather, the degree or extent of tax reduction.

APPENDIX

During the course of recent months the focus of community discussion in connection with integration has undergone certain changes. Whereas "busing" was a major discussion point earlier, the attention has substantially shifted away from this issue. In fact, there now seems very little opposition to busing per se. Such continued discussion as we now receive on this topic is more toward factual information (routes, arrangements, etc.) rather than controversy centered.

Common threads in discussion have dealt with finance, impact on the instructional program and staffing. We have attempted to meet these questions head-on as they have been raised. Many of these issues are dealt with in previous sections of this addendum.

The following list of questions and answers are illustrative of the types of questions that have been raised by the staff and the community:

Question 1: What, in your judgement, is the "ideal" school arrangement for Berkeley? What is your prediction concerning the duration of whatever plan is implemented in 1968?

Answer 1: This is a rather broad question. There is no single school arrangement that is "sacrosanct." Within

certain limitations a top-quality educational program is possible under many different plans. The ideal arrangement for any given community would vary according to local conditions, available facilities, etc.

As an ultimate arrangement, I share the enthusiasm of many teachers and of the School Master Plan Committee for the middle school idea -- that is, a school combining the upper elementary grades with the lower secondary grades.

By reducing the number of buildings in which the upper elementary grades are located from 14 to 4 under the K-3, 4-6 proposal, close collaboration with the junior high schools is facilitated. Joint collaboration among the faculties of the schools at these levels could lead toward a better articulated program for grades 4-8. Then, if at some future point it is possible to establish middle school campuses, the program could be readily moved right on to those campuses.

However, this would be some time in the future. The plan we are presenting is one we feel could stand up in its own right for an indefinite period, regardless of whether or not combining grades 4-8 on one site becomes feasible.

Question 2: What staff involvement will there be in shaping the "Educational Plan"? What staff involvement has there been?

Answer 2: The staff was invited during the past several months to submit ideas and suggestions about plans for integration - logistics and educational program. A discussion draft of "Helping Children Learn" - the recommendations of Integration Task Group II, were sent to each staff member. The staff was invited to react through faculty meetings, cross-sectional meetings, and/or individually. Integration: A Plan for Berkeley, which included broad proposals for our educational program was also sent to each staff member and reactions have been welcomed.

After the Board of Education adopts a plan, we anticipate that there will be numerous occasions during the next few months when staff will be involved in many facets of shaping the "Educational Plan." Some of these include working on curriculum committees, reacting to suggested scopes and sequence, helping to develop meaningful inservice education programs, planning with anticipated staff to meet their classes next year, in general sharing all of their good ideas that will help integration in September 1968 to work successfully.

Question 3: The Board of Education resolution calls for complete desegregation within the framework of quality education. Many interpreted this to mean that we would maintain quality education, not that we would have to provide additional programs, personnel, classrooms, etc., in order to

attain quality education. Please comment.

Answer 3: We would like to maintain the aspects of quality education that we already have in the Berkeley elementary schools as indicated on p. 17 of Integration: A Plan for Berkeley. We also feel that some areas need improvement, or that additional things can be done in an integrated environment to produce an even better quality of education, and these are reflected in parts of pp. 18-24.

Question 4: What is the anticipated impact of the integration proposals on class size? Will classes on the average be larger because of a "lack of money"? Will class loads be more uniform throughout the District? Will there be a "maximum" class load established to ensure that no class in the District becomes too large?

Answer 4: The anticipated impact of the integration proposals on class size is spelled out on p. 20 of Integration: A Plan for Berkeley - average class size of 24 in the primary grades and 28 in grades 4-6. Yes, class sizes would be more uniform. Current pupil/teacher ratios are approximately 23 in West Berkeley and 29 or 30 in East Berkeley. When all classes are integrated, the proposed 24 and 28 would be possible with the same number of homeroom teacher personnel that we now have. The Board of Education already has a policy that no class should exceed 35 and this would continue in effect. (This year out of

approximately 354 classes, only 56 exceeded 30, and only 5 exceeded 35. Where there were clusters of these larger classes, extra resource teacher personnel were added to those staffs.)

Question 5: Are Help Centers and/or Learning Laboratories essential to the success of either integration proposal? What priority do you assign to them relative to all the other legitimate demands being made on the budget?

Answer 5: The Learning Laboratories and the Help Centers greatly enhance the educational plan. The Learning Laboratory, with its additional resources and teacher, will provide an important resource to students and classroom teachers. It will add to the high potential program and also provide materials and an atmosphere where average and slower pupils can discover and become stimulated in their own special interest areas. The Help Center is something teachers and administrators have thought was needed for a long time. By providing a place away from the classroom for a child experiencing emotional stress, the teacher will be able to continue the job with her whole class and the child will be able to continue his learning and regain his composure. Both the Learning Laboratory and the Help Center should have high priority in our planning.

Question 6: What is the plan for deciding which staff personnel go to a specific school? What is the target date

for this and other major decisions that need to be implemented before the end of the current school year?

Answer 6: Elementary principals have already been polled re their specific interest as to either of the two types of proposals that have been presented. They have been asked to indicate their interest in remaining in their current location or transferring elsewhere within each of these two possibilities.

Once a specific plan is adopted by the Board, the principal's assignments will be announced to all elementary staff at the same time that all elementary teachers will be polled regarding grade level and specific school of preference.

In the same manner that the Ramsey Plan was implemented, teacher preferences will be given every consideration. Lists of teacher priority choices will be available to principals for their review and any interview deemed necessary will be accomplished early enough so that teachers will know their specific grade level and school of assignment before the close of the school year.

Question 7: Are the Laboratory Schools going to remain K-6? Are the Laboratory Schools going to be located in one strip?

Answer 7: No. The Laboratory Schools will not remain K-6 if the Board adopts a K-3, 4-6 plan to integrate the

elementary schools. Integration: A Plan for Berkeley proposed that they be located in one strip, and the principals of those schools recommend this.

Question 8: Isn't society fragmented enough without having the schools add yet another fragmented situation to the lives of the school children?

Answer 8: Society is fragmented, but we feel that the positive aspects of achieving effective integration of the elementary schools far outweigh possible articulation problems -- particularly if one readjusts one's thinking to the "expanded attendance zone" concept with still a continuous education from K-6 but housed in two different buildings. For years we have had children moving from the primary units into larger buildings at Franklin, Cragmont, and Hillside at 3rd and 4th grades, and the "fragmentation" -- if that's what one wants to call it -- hasn't seemed to harm them.

Question 9: Why was no feasible busing plan presented with the K-6 plan?

Answer 9: The difficulty in developing a feasible busing plan represented one of the major stumbling blocks of the K-6 plan. The logistical difficulties in community acceptance of any program which divides a neighborhood between those remaining in the neighborhood school for seven years and those who would be sent elsewhere for all seven years

would be sizeable. Members of the Lay Citizens' Advising and Review Committee, among others, urged that this type of division within the school attendance area not be made.

Question 10: What academic and socio-economic balance will there be in the K-3 schools?

Answer 10: In addition to racial balance, we are interested in having as high a degree of academic and socio-economic balance as possible. No plan, of course, will be perfect on these dimensions. However, each of the schools under the proposed K-3, 4-6 plan would represent a far greater cross-section in this regard than is now the case.

Question 11: Which 4-6 schools will "feed" which 7-8 schools?

Answer 11: Final decisions have not yet been made on this question. However, in view of the difference in size between Garfield and Willard, one or more of the 4-6 schools would probably have to be split between the two junior high schools. Our recommendation now is that the junior high school boundary remain as at present.

Question 12: How will "articulation" from grades 3 to 4 be effected?

Answer 12: Articulation from grades 3 to 4 will be handled at least as well as it is now from kindergarten to 1st, from primary building to main building, or from grade to grade. We will encourage staffs at the two levels to plan together good educational programs for the pupils that will provide truly for continuity of learning.

Question 13: How will the Oriental population be involved in the K-3 integration?

Answer 13: All of the zones contain some Oriental students, although not in equal numbers. It is true that the Oriental population will not be evenly distributed among the K-3 schools. However, the Oriental students would be no more concentrated under that program than at present. Furthermore, at the 4-6 level there would be considerably more contact between Oriental and Caucasian than is presently possible at those grade levels.

Question 14: How will specialized staff personnel be more effectively utilized, especially at the K-3 level?

Answer 14: In the question referred to in line 6 of p. 10 of Integration: A Plan for Berkeley, the following examples may help explain. A school which formerly held two classes at each grade level from K to 6 conceivably could have four classes at each grade level if it became a K-3 school. The speech therapist, for example, could remain at that school instead of traveling to two different sites to serve primary children, or could even develop an entirely different kind of scheduling or program for oral language in the primary grades. The possibilities could be explored for a full-time Remedial Reading teacher at each of the primary school sites in order to catch problems at the earliest moment. The advantages for specialized personnel such as

Foreign Language teachers, Instrumental Music, P.E., etc. were mentioned in the above document and probably are more obvious.

Special staff people will be able to work more effectively with the teachers since there will be more at each grade level at the same site when they visit.

We will try to assign male specialists to the K-3 schools also to help with the shortage of male classroom teachers in the teaching ranks at that level.

Question 15: What continuity in home contacts will there be for specialized personnel such as nurses and guidance consultants?

Answer 15: The district public health nurses will still have the same families, thus providing a continuing contact between the home and the school. Complete continuity for Guidance, Psychology, and Speech cases will be impossible. However, the staffs will have the opportunity to share information about cases as they have done in the past when personnel moved from one school to another. In certain critical cases the same person may be able to continue work with the family.

Question 16: What district-wide remedial instruction programs are there other than the one in reading?

Answer 16: At the present time Remedial Reading is the only district-wide remedial instruction program. We have

hopes that new state legislation which becomes effective next year may eventually help us to develop a possible remedial instruction program in mathematics.